

**SECRET**

OSA-2384-63

7 MAY 1963

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Dog Handlers and Fire Fighters

1. As a result of discussions regarding the assignment, utilization and control of airmen fire fighters and dog handlers, the following suggestions were made:

- A. Assign the airmen to an established Air Force unit (possibly March or Nellis AFB) and detail them to duty at the operating location. In this case it would be necessary to afford the designated USAF unit with Category Z exemption to cover these airmen, else it would penalize the unit with respect to promotions, levies, etc.;
- B. Assign the airmen to an Air Force unit and attach them to one of the organizations of the 1007th Air Intelligence Service Group for administration with duty at . . . . . It would be necessary to exempt these positions under Category Z for the same reasons specified in A above. Under this system, the 1007th Group would be assisting by handling the administration of these individuals. It would also afford a degree of control over these airmen, e.g., monitoring replacement actions and security controls. Promotion control, however, would remain with the USAF unit to which the individuals are assigned.
- C. Assign these airmen directly to a unit of the 1007th AIS Group and concurrently provide them with a document stating that the individuals are being assigned on a non-reimbursable basis and that they will be non-chargeable to Agency ceiling. In lieu of furnishing a document as described above, it is

**SECRET**

OSA-2384-63

Page 2

25X1A

possible that the non-reimbursable/non-chargeable provisions could be handled on an informal basis if requested by [redacted] and

D. Assignment of the airmen to a new unit which would be created under the 1020th Special Activities Wing and placed with the 1007th AIS Group for administration. In this instance, the spaces would be determined in advance by USAF and allotted at the time the organization is authorized. This proposal is very much like that described in C above, except that there would be no organizational connection with the 1007th and there would be no question of spaces and ceiling of the Agency.

2. It is my recommendation that we pursue recommendations C and D. The primary problem with A and B is that the airmen will be administered by an Air Force unit for whom they actually will not perform services. It is expected that the Air Force unit would not strongly endorse them for promotions over airmen who do perform services for the unit. This is especially important in the dog handler situation where the individuals nominated are primarily first-term men at A1C level, who, if they saw their counterpart security in the Air Force unit promoted, would feel that there is little use in continuing in our assignment and it is doubtful whether we will be able to retain many of them. The differences between C and D would be of interest to Security Staff, OSA, and it is that C would organizationally tie the new unit to the 1007th, whereas D would not. In both C and D, a reverse twist is used, which finds Colonel Geary supplying spaces on a non-reimbursable basis and request the Agency, in the form of MMPPD, to administer the unit. This, MMPPD is willing to assume; however, in view of the workload, it will be with some reluctance at subordinate levels.

25X1A

[redacted]  
Chief, Personnel Branch  
OSA-DD/R

**SECRET**

25X1A

PB/OSA [redacted] hrs  
6 May 1963

**Distribution:**

- 0 - PB/OSA
- 1 - AD/OSA
- 1 - SS/OSA
- 1 - PS/OSA
- 1 - D/FA/OSA
- 1 - RB/OSA

25X1A

